

RECEIVED

MAY 30 1997

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY**

MM Docket No. 93-25

Direct Broadcast Satellite Public Service Obligations

No. of Copies rec'd.
List ABCDE

Table of Contents

I.	Summary	1
II.	The Commission has the Discretion to Shape the Implementation of Section 25(b) to Respond to the Current Competitive Environment	8
III.	The Noncommercial Educational or Informational Programming Required to be Carried by DBS Systems Should Not be Limited to that Supplied by Publicly Funded Entities, to the Exclusion of Public-Private Partnerships	10
A.	The Statutory Language Does Not Support a Narrow Construction of Eligible Noncommercial Educational or Informational Programming	11
B.	There Is No Valid Policy Justification for Excluding Programming Supplied by Privately Funded Programmers from Satisfying DBS Educational Programming Requirements Under Section 25(b)(1)	14
IV.	Conclusion	17

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	
)	
Implementation of Section 25)	
of the Cable Television Consumer)	MM Docket No. 93-25
Protection and Competition Act)	
of 1992)	
)	
Direct Broadcast Satellite)	
Public Service Obligations)	

REPLY COMMENTS OF ENCORE MEDIA CORPORATION

Encore Media Corporation ("EMC") hereby submits its reply to comments filed by various parties in response to the Commission's Public Notice, "Comments Sought in DBS Public Interest Rulemaking," FCC 97-24, released January 31, 1997 ("Public Notice"). The Public Notice sought further comments from interested parties relating to implementation of Section 25 of the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992 ("1992 Cable Act"), which had directed the Commission to initiate a rule making proceeding to impose public interest and other requirements for providing video programming on direct broadcast satellite ("DBS") service providers.

I. Summary

There are several key issues facing the Commission in resolving this rule making proceeding as to the public interest obligations for DBS systems. But on one issue especially, there is a clear and fundamental division between the parties filing comments. That issue is whether programming supplied by a privately-funded programmer may qualify to satisfy the

Section 25(b)(1) requirement that DBS systems devote 4% to 7% of their channel capacity to “noncommercial programming of an educational or informational nature.”

These lines have been clearly drawn: the DBS system operators and the privately-funded program networks that seek to educate and inform, like EMC’s noncommercial WAM!/America’s Kidz Network, Jones’ Knowledge TV, and America’s Health Network,¹ assert that the clear intent of the statute was to increase the availability of noncommercial educational/informational programming, and that no rational limitation can be based on the public vs. private source of funding. The publicly funded broadcast entities and educational institutions, however, insist that Section 25(b)(1) was intended by Congress as an exclusive concession to them alone, and that the responsive programming should be chosen solely by the public agencies or institutions themselves without virtually any input from the DBS operators that are forced to carry it.

EMC submits that the DBS operators’ preferred approach, focusing on the quality and noncommercial nature (*i.e.*, without commercials) of educational/informational programming, rather than on the program providers’ non-profit or for-profit status, is the only rational approach. This approach is consistent with the Court of Appeals’ pronouncement in its decision upholding Section 25, that “Section 25 . . . represents nothing more than a new application of a well-settled government policy of ensuring public access to *noncommercial* programming.” Time Warner Entertainment Co. v. FCC, 93 F.3d 957, 976 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (emphasis added). The regime imposed by Section 25 has nothing to do with the source of funding, whether

¹ While America’s Health Network is presently advertiser-supported, it suggests that it would consider creating a noncommercial feed for DBS operators to use to meet Section 25(b)(1) requirements.

private or public; it relates only to providing noncommercial educational or informational programming to subscribers, which can be satisfied by privately funded (and completely noncommercial) services like EMC's WAM!.

Indeed, requiring that all such responsive noncommercial educational programming be produced by "national educational programming suppliers" that are either public institutions or nonprofits, fails to take into account the extremely valuable contributions that can and are being made by private corporations, such as EMC, in developing and delivering noncommercial educational programming for children. Through WAM!, EMC has developed a corporate sector solution to the urgent public need for privately funded educational resources. WAM! is the only full time, completely commercial-free network dedicated to educating and instructing by engaging the interests and needs of an underserved 8 to 16 year old audience. EMC submits that only a private programming corporation like EMC can afford to incubate such a targeted service which capitalizes on the promise of television, to harness the power of television to teach, to inspire, and to inform.

There can be no question that the overall quality of noncommercial educational programming a DBS operator can present on Section 25(b)(1) reserved channel capacity will be optimized by allowing maximum choices from the largest possible quantity of such educational programming, regardless of whether such noncommercial programming is produced or packaged by a publicly or privately funded programmer. If the goal of Section 25(b)(1) were simply to increase the program licensing volume for publicly-funded entities, it might make sense to restrict the eligibility of programmers under Section 25(b) to that narrow group. If, however, the goal of Section 25(b)(1) is to ensure that the highest quality noncommercial

educational programming is readily available to DBS subscribers, in a way that furthers the public interest by reliance on public-private partnerships as well, then the focus should be on the quality and responsiveness of the programming to the educational and informational needs of DBS subscribers, rather than on the program supplier's funding source. Certainly, there is nothing inherent in publicly funded status that results automatically in production of higher quality educational programming than private funding. WAM! and its programming have proved this to be true through their numerous accolades and awards from educators and other children's programming experts, demonstrating this private venture's ability to present exceptional educational programming (*see* Attachment A). No public interest goal is served, and no public interest benefits are obtained, by restricting programming that would fulfill Section 25(b)(1) requirements to only that produced by programmers who receive public funding.

Nor should the Commission adopt the approach proposed by local public, educational, or governmental ("PEG") cable access programmers and regulators² to convert the Section 25(b)(1) requirements to provide noncommercial educational and informational programming into a cable-type PEG structure for DBS operations. These groups propose the creation of a national PEG access agency to take over and program all channels required to be reserved by DBS operators, funded by a 5% tax on DBS operators' gross revenues and by additional contributions from federal agencies.

² See Joint Comments of Alliance for Community Media (representing interests of local cable PEG access corporations and agencies) and the National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors (representing local cable regulators) (hereafter referred to as "ACM/NATOA Comments"), at pages 11 to 15.

EMC submits that adoption of the PEG access model for DBS is absolutely the wrong approach. First, such an approach is nowhere required or suggested by the language of Section 25(b) of the 1992 Cable Act, and the adoption of a PEG regime without clear Congressional direction, especially with respect to the imposition of a tax to fund such efforts, would far exceed the authority granted to the Commission under this legislation. More critically, however, is that imposition of the PEG model on DBS would create the same failures that permeate the cable PEG access arena, specifically, creating capacity without effect. While there are many fine exceptions, the legacy of PEG channels locally throughout the country is of channels laying fallow, of alphanumeric service listings repeated over and over without any real substance. Outside of a few big cities, only a small fraction of PEG channels actually air valuable educational or informational programming.

In the context of DBS, the same failures would be replicated: without adequate funding, insufficient programming will be produced as compared to what can be produced through private enterprise efforts. The main reason why local PEG channels lay fallow or carry the same alphanumeric listings over and over is that there is not adequate funding to allow the production of programming to fulfill the well-intended PEG access mission. While ACM/NATOA recognize that the lack of adequate funding would be fatal to their PEG model for DBS, their solution -- a 5% tax on DBS gross revenues and more government funding -- will result in increased costs to consumers as such taxes are passed through to them and, as a byproduct, will result in DBS losing its competitive footing as an alternative to cable. Such a pass-through of increased costs harms consumers by making it less likely that alternatives to cable will thrive in the marketplace. Such increased costs also fly in the face of good public

policy. It is far better for consumers to provide them with equally high quality educational programming (and more of it) available through privately funded efforts, without reliance on more taxes and more government support.

Also questionable is the proposal from the association of DBS operators, the Satellite Broadcasting and Communications Association (“SBCA”), that the Commission sanction the establishment of an independent nonprofit organization to act as a clearinghouse to administer and coordinate a pool of public service programming which would be available to DBS operators. While this proposal is not nearly as problematic as the ACM/NATOA proposal to create a national PEG-type agency to administer all Section 25(b) programming, EMC questions the need for and the proposed responsibilities of SBCA’s suggested organization.

While there may be value to DBS operators in a clearinghouse which could reduce the need of such operators to deal with many different educational programming suppliers, there is no need for such an organization to assume the roles of defining the criteria for educational or informational programming or of endorsing or certifying certain programming as meeting those criteria. Rather, the Commission has the responsibility of adopting a simple and clear definition of “noncommercial programming of an educational or informational nature” as required to be provided under Section 25(b)(1), and the Commission should thereafter rely on the good faith judgements of DBS operators themselves to determine whether particular programming comports with such definition, just as the Commission does in the analogous context of determining compliance with the requirements of the Children’s Television Act. The Commission has the power to monitor and take action against abuses of the new regulations,

but in general, such reliance on the good faith determinations of the operators, as in the children's broadcasting context, would be workable and completely effective.

Within this framework, EMC submits that its WAM! children's educational network in its entirety should be considered to be responsive to Section 25 of the 1992 Cable Act's requirement that a minimum amount of DBS channel capacity be reserved for noncommercial programming of an educational or informational nature. WAM! is the only full-time, completely commercial-free network dedicated to educating and instructing the underserved 8 to 16 year old audience. WAM!'s entire schedule consists of programming designed to further the intellectual, cognitive, and social/emotional development of this adolescent age group, which is otherwise only minimally served by public broadcasters, commercial broadcasters, and other program networks. WAM!'s schedule includes at least twelve hours of noncommercial educational academic programming for adolescents each weekday, a private sector commitment unduplicated by any other network, institution, broadcaster, or channel, as well as many additional hours each day of informational, arts, developmental, and entertainment series aimed at guiding, motivating, and enlightening this target youth audience.

Indeed, WAM! was created specifically to provide educational and informational programming for the adolescent age group as a corporate solution to the very public problem of providing much needed educational resources and critical role-modeling guidance for this underserved age group, outside the context of any governmental requirements or imperatives. The fact that EMC is a private corporation does not in any conceivable or rational way detract from the quality of the noncommercial educational programming making up WAM!'s programming schedule.

EMC's WAM! network is a prime example of the type of noncommercial private programming initiative that should serve as the model of public service for the video programming industry in general, and for DBS systems in particular. EMC submits that the definition of "noncommercial programming of an educational or informational nature" adopted by the Commission to implement Section 25(b)(1) should be crafted in such a way as to provide that such valuable noncommercial educational and informational programming would satisfy the minimum programming percentage requirements of Section 25(b)(1).

II. The Commission Has the Discretion to Shape the Implementation of Section 25(b) to Respond to the Current Competitive Environment

Section 25 of the landmark 1992 Cable Act was a small part of that broad and significant legislation, added as a supplemental measure outside the legislation's much more visible focus on cable rates and must carry. And indeed, the five year delay in implementation of the broad public interest obligations for DBS under Section 25, due to the 1993 District Court action declaring the provision unconstitutional, erased Section 25 from the Commission's huge agenda that otherwise resulted in the prompt and comprehensive completion of the dozens of rule making proceedings brought on by the 1992 Cable Act. The removal of Section 25 from the massive 1992 Cable Act rule making package, and the five year delay before implementation, are themselves significant factors to be considered in how the present implementation of Section 25 should be shaped.

Now five years after passage of this legislation, two fundamental and defining events have transpired: first, the modern DBS industry was born, and second, the DBS industry has more recently posed a serious competitive challenge to traditional wired cable systems.

Nonetheless, one thing has *not* changed: DBS still has only a small fraction of the total number of subscribers that cable systems have, even in 1997. In order for DBS to thrive in this environment, to move into new urban markets that are still the bastion of cable, and, quite simply, to fulfill the fundamental goal of the 1992 Cable Act to provide “effective competition” to cable television systems throughout the country, the Commission’s ultimate decision in the present Section 25 rule making must allow DBS operators the flexibility to respond to educational needs in a changing marketplace and to fulfill its economic and social promise. Certainly, five years after the 1992 Cable Act imposed that goal of “effective competition,” no other type of multichannel video programming distribution system poses any realistic prospect of providing a significant level of competition to cable. But that dreamed-of competition is far from established as yet, and indeed, the radical and violent swings of fortunes in the nascent DBS industry are themselves the biggest story in communications today.

This current state of video competition should be the Commission’s guiding light in implementing Section 25 here in 1997. The Commission has broad discretion to ensure that the implementation of Section 25 comports with the overall goals of the 1992 Cable Act. Although it has not become effective until now, Section 25 is not a single, isolated piece of legislation that subsequently amended the 1992 Cable Act, but rather, it is but a small part of that broad, landmark 1992 Cable Act that placed “effective competition” as the Commission’s overarching goal. For all these reasons, the Commission should strive toward pro-competitive implementation regulations that shy away from penalizing or handicapping DBS, in favor of bringing public interest obligations into DBS programming in a way that supports DBS’s competitive posture.

III. The Noncommercial Educational or Informational Programming Required to be Carried by DBS Systems Should Not be Limited to that Supplied by Publicly Funded Entities, to the Exclusion of Public-Private Partnerships

In the immediate context of implementing Section 25, the Commission should avoid making the required provision of educational programming the sole province of a small group of public and educational broadcasters to the exclusion of private industry programmers which have developed and which present exceptional educational programming without government aid. EMC's WAM! children's programming network and other noncommercial educational or informational networks are striving to make public service programming work, through public-private partnerships that are the governmental and economic model now in 1997.

EMC's WAM! children's program network presents noncommercial educational children's programming on a full time basis every single day of the year. There are indeed a few features that distinguish noncommercial WAM!'s program schedule from programming presented by public broadcasters are: (i) WAM!'s superior quality (in EMC's view); (ii) WAM!'s *full time* dedication to enriching children's lives; (iii) a rights package that is designed for the convenience of teachers by providing a year-long taping and viewing window; and (iv) the for-profit business structure of WAM!'s corporate owner, EMC. If DBS operators, in their efforts to compete, choose to rely in part on privately-funded noncommercial educational programming such as WAM! to meet the requirements of Section 25(b)(1), in order to improve the overall quality of the total package of channels they want to offer the public, there is no public interest goal imaginable that would justify foreclosing that option. The arguments favoring exclusion of "noncommercial programming of an educational or informational nature"

produced or packaged by for profit corporations from that deemed eligible for fulfilling Section 25(b) educational programming requirements serve only to protect the turf of organizations that rely on public rather than private support and funding.

A. The Statutory Language Does Not Support a Narrow Construction of Eligible Noncommercial Educational or Informational Programming

So how do the public broadcasters support their view that Congress intended to grant them an exclusive right to provide programming in response to Section 25(b)(1)? The principal argument, made in the Comments filed by several public broadcasting entities and an amalgam of public ombudsman groups,³ is that, although the affirmative obligations stated in Section 25(b)(1) appear to require the reservation of channel capacity only to a *type* of programming identified as “noncommercial programming of an educational or informational nature,” a later provision, Section 25(b)(3) suggests that such reservation of channel capacity “*shall be satisfied* by making capacity available” to a class of programmers identified as “national educational programming suppliers.”⁴ According to these public broadcasting groups and their supporters, this language implies, by the use of “shall,” that those “national educational programming suppliers” are the only, exclusive class of program suppliers whose programming can be used to satisfy *any* portion of the Section 25(b)(1) educational programming requirements.

³ This position is set forth most strongly in the Joint Comments of the Public Broadcasting Service and the Association of America’s Public Television Stations, the association of licensees of PBS affiliates; the Joint Comments of ACM/NATO; and the Joint Comments of DAETC, Inc., et al., representing seventeen public ombudsman groups including Media Access Project, Consumer Federation of America, and Center for Media Education..

⁴ Section 25(b)(5) in turn states, “The term ‘national educational programming suppliers’ includes any qualified noncommercial educational television station, other public telecommunications entities, and public or private educational institutions.”

EMC submits that this narrow interpretation of Section 25(b)(1) should not be adopted by the Commission for two fundamental reasons: first, the language relied upon by these public broadcasting groups by no means requires that construction, and second, such a result would simply be bad policy in a context where the Commission clearly has the power, flexibility, and discretion to interpret these provisions in a manner which best implements other critical overall policy goals, based both in the 1992 Cable Act and in other subsequent policy initiatives. These powerful countervailing policies include that of reducing programming restraints and regulatory costs on potential competitors to traditional wired cable, to bring on the prompt introduction of “effective competition,” and that of fostering public-private partnerships to accomplish societal goals without the unnecessary expenditure of public funds and public financing.

With respect first to the language of the statute, as EMC and nearly all the DBS operators pointed out in their comments, the defined class of “national educational programming suppliers” is but a *subset* of the broader group of program suppliers which may provide “noncommercial programming of an educational or informational nature” to DBS operators in satisfaction of the Section 25(b)(1) public interest programming requirements. This subset of publicly-funded program producers is merely the class which is entitled to take advantage of the special discounted rate provisions of Section 25(b)(4). Had Congress intended to limit the eligible pool of qualified programming under Section 25(b)(1) as suggested by the public broadcasters, it would have used the narrower term “national educational programming suppliers” in Section 25(b)(1) rather than the broader language actually used, “noncommercial programming of an educational or informational nature,” which bears no restriction as to non-profit or for profit status, or to public or private funding.

Indeed, the legislative history of this provision lends substantial support to the broader interpretation of Section 25(b)(1) responsive programming, specifically, that there was not any intent to limit the producers of eligible programming only to those that are publicly-funded. The Commission noted in the NPRM that the House Report on the 1992 Cable Act, which discusses the language that served as a basis for Section 25(b)(1), cited various types of acceptable noncommercial “public service uses.” These uses were defined to include (1) programming produced by public telecommunications entities, including independent production services; (2) programming produced for educational, instructional or cultural purposes; and (3) programming produced by any entity to serve the disparate needs of specific communities of interest, including linguistically distinct groups, minority and ethnic groups, and other groups. See H.R. Rep. No. 628, 102d Cong., 2d Sess.. (1992), at 124. The Conference Report adopted this definition of public service uses as well for Section 25(b)(1) purposes. See H.R. Rep. No. 862, 102d Cong., 2d Sess.. (1992) (“Conference Report”), at 100.

Although the definition of “public service uses” was not retained in Section 25(b)(1) as finally passed, Congress did retain the reference to “programming of an educational or informational nature” in the key provision imposing the programming requirement. The “public service uses” definition is certainly as broad as advocated by EMC and the DBS operators, and in no sense suggests any limitation related to public rather than private funding of the producer or supplier. The legislative history of Section 25(b) thus provides substantial support for the conclusion that Congress envisioned that a broad range of programming could meet the requirements of Section 25(b)(1).

B. There Is No Valid Policy Justification for Excluding Programming Supplied by Privately Funded Programmers from Satisfying DBS Educational Programming Requirements Under Section 25(b)(1)

Moreover, restricting the program producers which may provide noncommercial educational programming to meet the requirements of Section 25(b)(1) to those which are publicly funded is simply bad policy, contrary not only to the policies of the 1992 Cable Act but to those of the 1996 Telecommunications Act as well. Indeed, as pointed out by Knowledge TV in its comments in this proceeding, the 1996 Telecommunications Act specifically endorses the creation of “public-private ventures” that will bring the promise of new technologies and new services to the public. See Telecommunications Act of 1996, Section 708. In this era of budgetary constraints, government is looking toward an increased role for private corporations to meet the educational and social needs of the population, through increased volunteerism and corporate efforts for the social good. Private corporations (like EMC) are often eager to undertake greater efforts (like WAM!) to give something back to the people and their communities. Moreover, private corporations have the ability to reallocate revenues from more profitable ventures to fund social-oriented efforts that may generate lower revenues. For example, a corporation such as EMC can tap into the profit and revenue streams of its other movie program services to incubate a channel such as WAM! that serves the public interest by fulfilling the need for educational resources for young people. However, reliance on public entities and nonprofits alone to meet such societal needs places too much of a burden on them in the face of ever tighter budgets and constraints on public funding.

These considerations must be taken into account in the narrower task before the Commission of developing regulations to implement Section 25(b) of the 1992 Cable Act. The

regulations should not place the full burden of providing noncommercial educational programming for DBS systems on public broadcasters and educational institutions, or else the public will be shortchanged by a lack of quantity and quality of such programming. At the same time, these DBS educational programming regulations should not close the door on private corporations, such as Encore Media Corporation, that are providing exemplary public service programming. EMC's WAM! is an example of the type of program channels that will best serve Congress's goals of providing commercial-free educational programming to DBS subscribers. Private initiatives such as EMC's WAM! children's programming network should be embraced as exemplary means of DBS operators meeting their obligations to present commercial-free educational programming to the public.

Congress's primary emphasis in creating this public interest programming requirement for DBS systems was that the educational programming be presented *without any commercial matter*, not that the source of the programming be publicly funded. Throughout the prior debate over the Children's Television Act of 1990, numerous educators and children's programming experts testified as to the negative impact of advertising on children's educational and entertainment programming. By contrast, the public or private character of the producing entity has no real bearing on the educational quality of that programming, except perhaps in a positive way due to the greater financial resources that may be available to a private corporation. Moreover, the private sector, unencumbered by concerns of funding limitations, can be highly flexible in meeting needs of specific targeted groups. These substantial public interest benefits are realized through the noncommercial nature of the programming, not as a result of the public or private nature of the entity which packages or supplies the programming. Indeed, WAM!'s

contribution as a private sector solution to educational needs has repeatedly been recognized by Congress and the Commission.

On the other hand, there is no conceivable public interest served by limiting the potential sources of noncommercial educational or informational programming to the narrow class of national educational programming suppliers as defined in Section 25(b)(3). Indeed, placing too strong an emphasis on public television stations and institutional program suppliers is illusory, since many of such public television program *suppliers and producers* are themselves for profit corporations or individuals, not nonprofits.

A further policy reason militating against limiting those eligible to provide noncommercial educational or informational programming in response to Section 25(b)(1) requirements to only the smaller group of “national educational programming suppliers” is that such a limitation unnecessarily restricts the opportunities and incentives for DBS operators to offer the maximum possible amount and highest quality of noncommercial educational programming contemplated by the statute. The Commission should not interpret Section 25(b)(1) in a manner that constrains DBS operators’ ability to choose from the widest possible variety of *qualified* programming.

EMC urges the Commission to conclude that the DBS educational programming requirements set forth in Section 25(b)(1) of the 1992 Cable Act -- that a portion of DBS channel capacity be devoted to educational or informational programming -- can be satisfied at least in part by carriage of any noncommercial educational or informational programming, regardless of the privately or publicly funded nature of the entity supplying such programming to the DBS operator.

IV. Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, EMC urges the Commission to adopt rules in this proceeding that would allow DBS systems' public interest programming obligations to be met by airing noncommercial educational and informational programming provided by any source of such programming, including private corporations such as EMC. The noncommercial educational or informational programming qualifying for this reservation of channel capacity need not be produced exclusively by "national educational programming suppliers" -- not for profit educational institutions or public broadcasting entities -- in order to qualify as programming that would meet these requirements. Rather, Congress's true goal in establishing these public service requirements on DBS operators was to foster the carriage of *commercial-free* educational programming. Restricting eligible programming to that produced by this narrower class of public broadcasters and educational institutions would impose an undue burden on these publicly funded entities, when in fact private corporate solutions can better meet the need for such noncommercial educational programming.

Respectfully submitted,

ENCORE MEDIA CORPORATION

By Richard H. Waysdorf JSD
J. Steven Beabout,
Senior Vice President - Legal and
Administration
Richard H. Waysdorf,
Corporate Counsel, Affiliate Relations
Encore Media Corporation
5445 DTC Parkway, Suite 600
Englewood, CO 80111
Telephone: (303) 771-7700

May 30, 1997

WAM! AMERICA'S KIDZ NETWORK

Attachment A

WAM! America's Kidz Network

AWARDS AND RECOGNITIONS

- **Beacon Awards**

- 1997 Winner in the Government Relations Category
- Finalist in the Video Promotion and PSA Categories

- **CTAM Mark Awards**

- Finalist in the Program Promotion/Tune-In: Interstitial On-Air Promotion Category

- ***Sky Trackers***

- 1994 Australian Film Institute: Best Children's Drama
- 1995 Banff Television Festival: Finalist for Best Children's Series
- 1995 Media New Award: Best Children's Series

- ***Press Gang***

- 1990 BAFTA: Best Children's Programme
- 1990 Television Movie Awards: Best Children's Drama
- 1993 N.Y. International Film & T.V. Festival: Finalist in Children's Category

- ***Kerrisdale***

- 1993 & 1994 Top Canadian Children's Program
- 1995 Media Agency: Panasonic Award
- 1995 Association for Media & Technology Education in Canada Excellence Award

WAM! America's Kidz Network

INTELLIGENT, TRUST-WORTHY TELEVISION

- All WAM! programs instruct, inspire, motivate and guide
- Sixty hours per week of subject-specific core education
 - Mathematics
 - Science
 - Social Studies
 - Language Arts
 - Personal Development
 - Arts
- Non-commercial - short features run between programs (where other channels run commercials)
 - *WAM!Hosts* - honor roll students serve as hosts, providing context for programs and critical viewing tips (Media Literacy)
 - *WAM!CAMs* - profiles of extraordinary young people
 - *ART!CAMs* - profiles of talented young people
 - *ART-I-FACTS* - quotes and facts about music and culture
 - *WAM!Words* - enhance vocabulary skills
 - *Geobits* and *Where In The WAM! World Are They?* - provide geography skills
 - *WAM!Whiz Tips* - aid studying and test taking
 - *WAM! Makes A Difference* - profiles of outstanding kid volunteers
- Socially-responsible mission
 - Encourages kids to reach their potential
 - Aids in navigation of awkward adolescent years
 - Helps kids become leaders and informed, effective citizens

WAM! America's Kidz Network

CARES ABOUT THE DEVELOPMENT OF KIDS

SAMPLES OF WHAT STUDENTS LEARN FROM WAM! PROGRAMS

- **Social Studies**
 - *We Are the Children*
Global Understanding
Location of major countries and cities
Compare, contrast and find commonalities among 36 different cultures
 - *Kids Planet Video*
Appreciate diversity
Culture, traditions and economic realities of youngsters around the world
Media Literacy
- **Science**
 - *Friends of Research & Odd Gadgets*
Research and experimentation (hand-on science)
Data Collection and scientific methods/observations
Creative solutions to problem-solving
 - *How 2*
Draw conclusions based on observation and data
Apply scientific principles to real life situations
Conduct simple scientific experiments to support theories
- **Language Arts**
 - *Mission Reading*
Decipher words, expand vocabulary and enjoy reading
Recognize writer's "points of view"
 - *Read All About It*
Develop an appreciation for literature
Understand plot structure, character development
Improve reading comprehension

- **Arts**

- ***Art Attack***

- Develop creative, self-expression using variety of common household items
Identify and utilize different techniques: oil painting, shading, collage, cut-outs

- ***Music Factory & Musical Encounter***

- Gain appreciation of music and the dedication it takes to be a musician
Learn about composers and music styles
Differentiate between Major and Minor chords

- **Mathematics**

- ***Mathematical Eye***

- Practical applications of math in everyday situations
Patterns and how they relate to numbers and equations
Makes math fun, accessible, entertaining
Improves comprehension of math theories, theorems, logic and deductions
Biographical knowledge of famous mathematicians and theorists